



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,385	07/09/2002	Stone Cheng	9141-US-PA	4026

31561 7590 03/28/2006

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE
7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100
ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2
TAIPEI, 100
TAIWAN

EXAMINER

PIERRE, MYRIAM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,385

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

Myriam Pierre

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 91111324.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Regarding Amendment filed 01/05/2006 regarding Office Action of 10/05/2005, the proposed changes are approved by the examiner, amending of claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9; cancelled claim 5; and new claims 10-17.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's argument with respect to claims 1-9 regarding "locating a language string within the external language file" has been considered and is persuasive but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-8, and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Palevich et al. (5,630,131).

As to claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach

starting an application on said computer system (col. 7 lines 8-16);

choosing a desired language (Fig. 3 col. 13 lines 11-18 and col. 14 lines 21-26);

Art Unit: 2654

searching an external language file (col. 6 lines 44-58; inherent in data storage device, such as floppy disk) associated with desired language (locale language) (col. 12 lines 1-11 and col. 10 lines 56-67 and col. 11 lines 40-53 and Fig. 1 element 126; locale language stored in archive, archive in shared library, shared library stored in data storage device, element 126, in which the data storage device comprise a hard disk or removable-media disk, thus, the removable disk inherently has external files);

locating a language string within the external language file (col. 12 lines 1-11; although not all objects include strings, localization of an application would require a translation of text strings embedded within an object); and

redrawing the user interface based at least in part on said language string without closing the application (col. 34 lines 17-27, claim 1 d; users can design a new user interface and then load that new user interface into a running program without stopping and restarting the running program).

As to claims 2 and 11, which depend on claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach further comprises redrawing said user interface in an original language with the desired language (col. 12 lines 44-61; the overriding operations means that whatever local is chosen, some are stored in the chosen locale while others are at higher levels of the locale hierarchy).

As to claims 3 and 12, which depend on claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach and further comprising modifying the language string to comply with the desired

Art Unit: 2654

language in response to an absence of a language string associated with the desired language (col. 12 lines 1-50, 63-67; translate via localization, the local language may require a translation of text strings embedded in the object, the embedded strings in root objects maybe any language, depending on the application, the process of selecting a language which matches a text string inherently responses to an absence of desired language, otherwise, there would not be a need to select a different language via translation or localization of the original language/text string).

As to claims 4 and 13, which depend on claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach and further comprising modifying the external file to comply with the desired language in response to an absence of an external file associated with the desired language (col. 12 lines 1-50, 63-67 and col. 13 lines 1-15; archive files, program requests an object from archive, copy of object for current system locale but program may also request object from a specified local, augment route local via language level, country level, and regional level or dialects).

As to claims 6 and 14, which depend on claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach wherein the language string comprises a plurality of language strings (col. 12 lines 1-50, 63-67).

As to claim 7 and 15, which depend on claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach wherein the external language file comprises a plurality of external

Art Unit: 2654

language files (col. 12 lines 1-50, 63-67 and col. 13 lines 1-15 and col. 12 lines 40-67 and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 8 and 16, which depend on claims 1 and 10, Palevich et al. teach the application is operated on an inherent operating system (col. 7 lines 18-25 and col. 9 lines 40-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palevich et al. (5,630,131) as applied to claims 8 and 16 above, and further in view of Chou (5,583,761).

As to claim 9, Palevich et al. teach an operating system (col. 7 lines 18-25 and col. 9 lines 40-55).

Palevich et al. does not teach plurality of operating systems.

However, Chou does teach wherein the operating system comprises a variety of operating systems (abstract, windows or Unix).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Palevich et al.'s multilingual graphic interface with Chou's automatic displaying program in different

Art Unit: 2654

languages because this would offer the user the flexibility to work with DOS, OS/2, Windows, and Unix, thus application can be pure text based and/or graphic based. (Chou Abstract).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 a.m. - 2:00p.m.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information as to the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3/18/2006 MP


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER